CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT" REPORT FOR BASIN PLAN AMENDMENT

(RESOLUTION NO. R3-2002-0094)

The CCRWQCB is proposing an amendment to the WQCP – Central Coast Region (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan serves as the cornerstone for water quality protection through indentification of beneficial uses of surface and ground waters, establishment of water quality objectives to protect beneficial uses, and establishment of an implementation plan to achieve those objectives.

The Basin Planning process has been certified as "functionally equivalent" to the preparation of the Environmental Impact report (EIR) for the purposes of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Section 15251, Title 4, California Code of Regulation ((CCR)). Based on the certification, this Basin Plan Amendment Report is used in lieu of an EIR or a Negative Declaration.

Any Regional Board regulatory program certified as functionally equivalent, however, must satisfy the documentation requirements of Section 377 (a), Title 23, CCR. This report satisfies part (a) of that section. It contains the following:

- 1. A Description of Proposed Activity and Proposed Alternatives,
- 2. An Environmental Checklist and a Description of the Proposed Activity,
- 3. An Environmental Evaluation, and
- 4. A determination with respect to significant Environmental Impacts.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY

This section describes the changes proposed and alternatives to this proposal. The purpose of this amendment is to update the Surveillance and Monitoring chapter of the Basin Plan to include new monitoring and assessment programs developed since the last revision and to remove and/or modify programs that no longer exist or have changed since the last revision.

Alternatives to this proposal include:

Partial adoption of the proposed amendment

This alternative is not recommended because incomplete adoption of the proposed amendment will result in an incomplete description of current monitoring and assessment efforts directed at protecting water quality in the region.

1. Modify amendment

This alternative is recommended if the modification does not result in an incomplete description of current monitoring and assessment efforts and if the modification(s) are consistent with protection of water quality.

2. Take no action.

This alternative is not recommenced because it does not provide for up-to-date information on monitoring and assessment programs that provide for protection of water quality.

4. Additional amendments

The Regional Board may consider additional amendments, but will limit its action to a logical outgrowth of the proposed action plan. Other amendments will be subject to public notice and comment at the time those changes are proposed.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REQUIREMENTS

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	AESTHETICS Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, But not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings with a state scenic highway?				
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings				
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area				\boxtimes
2.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				

3.	AIR QUALITY Where available, the				
	significance criteria established by the				
	applicable air quality management or air				
	pollution control district may be relied				
	upon to make the following				
	determinations. Would the project				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of				
u)	the applicable air quality plan?			Ш	
b)	Violate any air quality standard or				
U)	contribute substantially to an existing or				
	projected air quality violation?			Ш	
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net				
C)	•				
	increase of any criteria pollutant for which				
	the project region is not attainment under an				
	applicable federal or state ambient air				
	quality standard (including releasing				
	emissions which exceed quantitative				
	thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial				
	pollutant concentrations?				
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a				
	substantial number of people?				
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would				
	the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either				
ŕ	directly or through habitat modifications, on				
	any species identified as a candidate,				
	sensitive, or special status species in local or				\square
	regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by		_	_	
	the California Department of Fish and Game				
	or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any				
0)	riparian habitat or other sensitive natural				
	community identified in local or regional			_	
	plans, policies, regulations or by the				
	California Department of Fish and Game or				
	US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
<u>a)</u>	Have a substantial adverse effect on				
c)					
	federally protected wetlands as defined by				
	Section 404 of the Clean Water Act				
	(including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal			Ш	
	pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal,				
	filling, hydrological interruption, or other				
	means?				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of				
	any native resident or migratory fish or	_			
	wildlife species or with established native				
	resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or				
	impede the use of native wildlife nursery				

sites?									
III. ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (o									
Significant Impact, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, or Less than Significant Impact)									
No environmental impacts are expected to result from this amendment.									
IV. DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)									
On the basis of this initial evaluation:									
_X_I find the proposed project COULD NOT have	e a signific	ant effect on the	e environme	ent.					
I find that the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. These alternatives and mitigation measures are discussed in the attached written report.									
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts. See the attached written report for a discussion of this determination.									
Signature	Date								